

VZCZCXRO6275
PP RUEHMA RUEHPA
DE RUEHRY #0501 2491342
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
P 051342Z SEP 08
FM AMEMBASSY CONAKRY
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2898
INFO RUEHZK/ECOWAS COLLECTIVE
RHEFDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC
RHMFISS/HQ USAFRICOM STUTTGART GE

UNCLAS CONAKRY 000501

SIPDIS
SENSITIVE

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PGOV](#) [ASEC](#) [PREL](#) [GV](#)
SUBJECT: FIRED PORT OFFICIAL REFUSES TO GIVE UP POST

¶1. (U) The recent spate of presidential decrees coupled with several controversial "false decrees" over the last few months, has some Guineans questioning the legitimacy of these newest presidential appointments. In the case of the Port of Conakry, the former Director General of the Port, Oulaba Kabassan Keita, is refusing to cede his post to his successor, Mamadouba Sankon, who was appointed by presidential decree on August 27.

¶2. (U) According to an article on an internet news site (Aminata.com), Keita maintains that the president did not authorize his dismissal. Keita, who was transferred to another post at the Ministry of Transportation by the same August 27 decree, is quoted as saying "I went to meet the president to thank him for renewing his confidence in me by transferring me to my new post. The president was astonished that I was talking about a new decree...and told me to stay in my current post."

¶3. (SBU) Union leader Mme Rabiadou Serah Diallo had brought up the case during a meeting with A/DCM on September 3. She said that the president told the former port official that he had never authorized his transfer and ordered him to return to his regular post.

¶4. (SBU) A contact at the Bureau of Customs confirmed the same story with Pol LES, adding that the new Director General has tried to report to his office, but that he has been blocked by Keita. According to contact, the Port is in a kind of limbo since no one is sure who is authorized to fill the position.

COMMENT

¶5. (SBU) The incident has sparked numerous rumors in Conakry with some citizens questioning whether the August 27 decree was yet another "false decree" that the president never signed, while others are suggesting that the president may have signed it, but did not know what he was signing. Both scenarios are possible. Contacts are increasingly concerned about what is going on within the presidency, and who is actually governing the country. END COMMENT.
BROKENSHIRE